IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RSA NO.15 of 2007

DATE OF DECISION: January 9, 2007

Suchetra Mehta and another

….Appellants

VERSUS

Haryana Urban Development Authority and another

….Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINEY MITTAL

PRESENT: Shri Sanjay Bansal, Advocate for the appellants.

Viney Mittal,J.(Oral).

The learned First Appellate Court has rightly observed that Civil Court had no jurisdiction to examine the legality of the resumption order passed under Haryana Urban Development Authority Act, 1977 in view of the bar contained in Section 50 of the Act.

In view of the aforesaid observations made by the learned First Appellate Court, the learned counsel appearing for the appellants states that the present appeal may be dismissed as not pressed with a liberty to the appellants to seek their statutory remedy in accordance with law.

Dismissed as not pressed with liberty, as aforesaid.

Before parting with this order, it is also observed that the appellants would also be at liberty to seek the condonation of delay, if

and when any remedy is sought by them, in accordance with law, against the resumption order.

A copy of the order be given dasti on payment of usual charges.

January 9, 2007 (Viney Mittal)
KD Judge